



## GROUP 4

ARCHITECTURE  
RESEARCH +  
PLANNING, INC

211 LINDEN AVENUE

SO. SAN FRANCISCO

CA 94080 USA

T: 650-871-0709

F: 650-871-7911

www.g4arch.com

JONATHAN HARTMAN  
ARCHITECT

DAWN E. MERKES  
ARCHITECT

DAVID SCHNEE  
ARCHITECT

ANDREA GIFFORD  
ARCHITECT

CAROLYN CARLBERG  
ARCHITECT

GARY CHING  
ARCHITECT

JILL EYRES  
ARCHITECT

BENJAMIN IRINAGA  
ARCHITECT

DANIEL LAROSSA  
ARCHITECT

WILLIAM LIM  
ARCHITECT

TERESA ROM  
ARCHITECT

## MEETING ON

8 April 2019

12:00 - 2:00 Pm

Annex - Barrett Community Center

## PROJECT

BELMONT COMMUNITY CENTER

Advisory Committee Meeting 01

## ATTENDEES

Name	Initials	Attended	Company or Organization
Warren Lieberman	WL		Vice Mayor
Julia Mates	JM	X	Councilmember
Chuck Cotten	CC	X	Parks & Rec Commissioner
Nicki Fox	NF	X	Parks & Rec Commissioner
Nathan Majeski	NM		Planning Commissioner
Amy Goldfarb	AG	X	Planning Commissioner
John Violet	JV	X	City Treasurer
Tina Hughes	TH	X	BRSSD school district representative
TBD			Belmont Business Owner representative
Kathleen Beasley	KB	X	Belmont Library representative
Alan Sarver	AS	X	Sequoia Union HSD Trustee
Greg Snow	GS	X	Youth Sports Representative
Maggie Pavao	MP		Youth Representative
Chelsea Chang	CC		Youth Representative
Rich Bortoli	RB	X	Member at Large, Senior representative
Judy King	JK	X	Member at Large, Senior representative
Adar Emken	AE	X	Member at Large
David Braunstein	DB		Member at Large
Becket Feierbach	BF		Member at Large
Harmandeep Madra	HM	X	Member at Large
Sergey Sergeev	SS		Member at Large
Lillian Svec	LS	X	Member at Large
Thomas Fil	TF		Finance Director
Brigitte Shearer	BSS	X	Director, Parks & Recreation Department
Dawn Merkes	DM	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning
Andrea Gifford	AG	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning
Kaifeng Zhang	KZ	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning

## MINUTES

### 1. Welcome + Introductions

BS welcomed the committee and the public, and reviewed the meeting format with them. BS explained the meeting format, where the advisory committee will have the first opportunity to review and discuss information that is presented, and then will be opened up to the public in attendance. The committee and project team introduced themselves and who they represented on the committee.

#### a. Blog Exercise



Blogs were distributed to meeting attendees to fill in to assist in envisioning opportunities and goals for the new community center.

## **2. Committee + Project Overview**

DM reviewed the project work plan, tasks, participation plan and project schedule with the committee. The following input was received from the participants

- a. JM - Are we here to make decisions on the vision of the new facility? Will be it a membership based or fee-based facility? What will the funding strategy be? Will there be public and private partnership?  
DM – Responded that the vision for the new community center will be established as part of the study, however separate special studies may need to be conducted to address a detailed funding strategy, a financing plan, and an operations/business plan.

## **3. Top 9 Best Practices for Planning + Designing of Community Center**

AG reviewed the current best practices for planning and designing community centers as they relate to the development of the proposed new Belmont Community Center. The following input was received from the participants

- a. The committee commented that parking at the new facility should be adequate and accessible for all modes of transportation
- b. The committee asked if the new community center would be a multi-story building? It will most likely be 2 stories depending on program needs. Maximum of 2 stories is allowed by the City's zoning code without a variance.

## **4. Goals - Blog Exercise Report Bask**

DM outlined the purpose of the Blog exercise was to help identify goals for the project as it relates process. Project and outcomes. The participants were asked to report back the most noteworthy/important thing for their visions of the new community center on their blog

- a. CC – amazed by the energy and enthusiasm of folks that use the current site. DM – responded that the current estimate of the number of users by P&R for the site and the building is over 100,000 visits every year.
- b. AS – impact of the new center: more than 5,000 visitors from each preschool, elementary school, high school, middle school, adult and senior citizens of Belmont.
- c. KB – love a community center that is located in Colorado. It includes a pool with waterslide that attracted people of all ages.
- d. AE – waterslides in other community centers were the most memorable for my daughter. Loves the hybrid community center + library in Almaden Valley.
- e. JM – understand that a pool might be a lofty goal. Noticed that middle school and high school students were being kicked out of the Carlmont Village Shopping Center by security guards, we need a safe place for them to congregate + play basketball + do homework outside.
- f. HM – love cooking classes, a place to exercise, and a pool for all ages.
- g. JV – found the right mix of rural & urban characteristics for my family here at Belmont.



- h. TH – want to create a place that gives Belmont residents a sense of pride, a facility that all the young users will want to return to and maybe work there.
- i. JK – suggest that Belmont have a sculpture garden at the new community center.
- j. RB – flexibility in the new facility is important. Interested in seeing what program can fit on the site and how it will be funded.
- k. NF – envisioning a facility that includes daycare that is safe and state of art, ceramics studio, a spot that gets recognition, a major hub for the community.
- l. LS – the new community center has made Belmont feels like home. Place for youth to congregate, learn + grow; multigenerational health, fitness + wellness club; Belmont needs a centralized place for people to be involved in the visual + performing arts + DIY activities

DM – commented that the design team will be translating the goals developed for the site and the building by the committee, the community and community leaders into evaluation criteria that will be developed to assist in analysis of the site and building options.

## **5. Site Analysis + Opportunities**

AG reviewed the current site analysis prepared by the project team. DM commented that a consideration for the committee for the program options might be if the proposed program is to meet a regional or a local need. The top complaints that the design team have heard for the current site are: 1) ingress and egress for vehicles, 2) unsafe pedestrian/crosswalk access at the entry off of Ralston, 3) overflow parking that impact neighbors on Belburn Ave. The committee's comments were as follows:

- a. BSS – Commented that the outdated and inadequate restrooms are complained about most. The design team said that this was an issue that came up in the stakeholder interviews, and we also heard that the spaces are at capacity and there is demand for more programs.  
DM – summarized that the existing building is aged, building systems are failing, they do not meet any life safety or accessibility codes, and that reuse of the buildings will cost more than building new.
- b. CC – is there any salvage value for the components of the existing building? DM – the materials will be salvaged as part of the demolition process but, at most this would be at a breakeven cost but more likely an added costs to the construction.
- c. JV – is the intent to keep the current programs running during construction? We will need to provide temporary space for those programs, will involve temporary relocation and phasing of the project. If the new building is located on the south side of the site, it will have a better street front, can eliminate the need for temporary facilities, and might lose the athletic fields for 18-24 months, might not necessarily lose parking during construction depending on how the site is planned out.
- d. KB – there are so many schools nearby, the library draws users regionally. There is going to be a regional draw for users if they are



attracted to use other facilities/amenities in Belmont and use the new community center while they are here.

DM commented that it would be helpful if the library was able to provide the stats for the addresses of their users broken down by City of resident so that the team had a sense of what percentage of people are coming from out of town. .

- e. JH – interested in knowing what percentage of P&R’s revenue is coming from the current center.

- f. JK – the artist studio rental is a revenue generator for the city.

DM responded that the artist rents are not based on market value and are not necessarily the highest and best use for the site.

## **6. Facility Needs + Opportunities**

AG summarized the outreach that was being completed on the needs for site and the building and KZ reviewed the feedback to date. The following input was received from the committee:

- a. Non-duplication should be considered when looking at adjacent facilities and facility use matrix.
- b. Expense + revenue potential
  - i. AS – this site will not be an ideal location for an ice skating rink. An ice rink needs to be at a transportation hub as it is a regional draw for users, similar to a pool.
  - ii. Fixed seat theaters
    - 1. Notre Dame de Namur University is interested in partnering with the city for use of the theater.
    - 2. Belmont Library has an amphitheater for program uses as well.
- c. The community survey shows that the people are leaning towards a pool at the new facility, will be helpful to show cost associated with a pool to the community.

## **7. Preliminary Findings + Next Steps**

DM reviewed national planning standards for recreation facilities as well as information for comparable and neighboring communities. The information was introduced to the committee to give them a preview of one of the ways that the how the program options will be tested against. The committee shared the following comments:

- a. JK – will we need to give up fields for other programs?  
DM – not likely, we will balance the building program, site program and the parking in the design options.
- b. RB – parking will need to be more efficient and safer for users.  
DM - underground parking is costly, however parking standards are going down. Best practice is not to plan for parking for peak events.
- c. JV – Library and park was funded by a bond that cost \$71 per household, it funded the issuance of the bond, construction cost of \$11 million, and maintenance of the library and park for 30 years.  
DM – regarding funding, opportunities are limited, we can look at local ballot measure, sell naming rights, and potentially use a geo bond.



8. The upcoming community outreach events were summarized to the attendees and encouraged to participate and inform their friends and constituents.

Attachments: Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Presentation

These minutes were prepared on April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

**END**